

REMARKS

The above-referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated **March 28, 2005**, in which claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11-19, 21 & 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charny in view of Cloonan. In addition, claims 9, 10, 20 and 23-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charny in view of Cloonan and further in view of Momirov. In response, Applicants requested an interview to discuss the Final Office Action. Applicants and the Examiner conducted the Examiner Interview on May 19, 2005. The substance of the discussions between Applicants and the Examiner during the Interview are captured in an Examiner Interview summary dated May 24, 2005.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above claims have been amended merely to further differentiate the independent claims over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's statement in the Interview Summary that "Applicant considers to further amend the claims to differentiate them over the prior art." See Interview Summary dated May 24, 2005.

Current Status of Claims:

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9-12, 14-16, 18, 20-23, 25-27 and 29-33 remain in the application. Claims 2, 4-6, 8, 13, 17, 19, 24, and 28 have been canceled. Applicants offer to amend claims 1, 3, 7, 9-12, 14-16, 18, 20-23, 25-27 and 29-33 as above. Support for the amendments can be found in the original specification, claims and/or figures. In this regard, no new matter has been introduced.

Application No. 09/539,795
Atty. Docket No. P7779

-13-

Examiner Elallam
Art Unit 2662

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Applicants thank the Examiner for agreeing during the Interview that independent claims 1, 12, and 23, as amended above, are not disclosed by the prior art of record (Cloonan, Charny and Momirov). In addition, Applicant notes that claims 3, 7, 9-11, 14-16, 18, 20-22, 25-27 and 29-33 each depend from one of independent claims 1, 12, or 23. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw rejection of independent claims 1, 12, and 23 and dependent claims 3, 7, 9-11, 14-16, 18, 20-22, 25-27 and 29-33.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, 7, 9-12, 14-16, 18, 20-23, 25-27 and 29-33, are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. *The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.*

Respectfully submitted,
Robert M. Grow et al.

Date: 6/23/05by: 

Ted A. Crawford

Reg. No. 50,610

Patent Attorney for Assignee Intel Corporation

Intel Corporation
PO Box 5326
SC4-202
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326
Tel: (503) 712.2799

Application No. 09/539,795
Atty. Docket No. P7779

-14-

Examiner Elallam
Art Unit 2662